REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claim 39 is objected to due to informalities. Applicants have corrected the informalities.

Claims 6-9, 36-38 and 43-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration. For example, claim 6 and the other claims are not without any structural component and do not consist solely of language that is implemented with only software. The cited paragraph 32 refers to processors executing software and hence the claims must be read in light of the Specification. Apparatus that employ processors and other structures are compliant with 35 U.S.C. §101. In addition, claim 6 requires, among other things, generating a translucent identification member. Applicants have amended claim 6, although not believed necessary, to indicate more detail. The other claims are also believed to be compliant with 35 U.S.C. §101 since the claims must be read in light of the Specification and corresponding structure must be attributable to the structure stated in the claims. Certain claim limitations may be implemented as specific computers and other structure as set forth in the Specification as examples. Therefore the claims are directed to patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 6 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration. The Specification does show a translucent identification member without a corresponding filtering pattern thereon. For example, FIG. 1 illustrates the translucent identification member 14 with no filtering pattern thereon as does FIG. 4. Other support is in the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 22-28 and 52-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,246,375 (Goede). The Goede reference does not teach

each and every limitations of the claims. For example, claim 1 requires, among other things, assigning identification information to one or more obscure user identifiers and providing the identification information on the translucent identification member. Cited column 1, lines 44-47 do not teach assigning identification information to one or more obscured user identifiers. It appears that the office action may be confusing the "predetermined sequence" described in Goede which is a password or personal identifier that is obscured in the array of numbers with the "location designating means". The location designating means in Goede correspond to the axis on the Goede card. There is no additional "identification information" assigned to any of the numbers on the card nor are there identification information provided on the translucent identification member that is different from the obscured user identifiers. As claimed, the identification information may be, for example, a serial number or other translucent identification member identifier that is different from the obscured user identifiers. The other independent claims also refer to the identification information. The Goede reference does not teach the claimed subject matter and as such, the claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 11-20 and 29-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oksman et al. in view of Goede. The Goede reference requires two different members, a transparent substrate 12 and a recording means 22 (column 4, lines 30-52). A user places a mark at each individual cell that corresponds with one of the predetermined sequence elements in each of the cells of the recording means 22. The Goede apparatus requires the two members 12 and 22 in order for the Goede system to work. As stated in column 3 lines 44-59, the user merely has to memorize a location H3 in order to correctly line up the recording means 22 with the substrate 12. The user has to memorize the coordinate which is always the same. Also the user is the one that decides which letters of the array on the recording means 22 identify the password of the

user. The user for example colors in certain locations which when overlayed or underlayed with the card 12 indicate the users password for example. As such, instead of the user having to remember a 10 digit personal identification number, the user only needs to remember for example the combination D7 to locate a corner of the recording sheet 12 relative to a coordinate on a card 12. The recording sheet has boxes shaded that the user selected apriori to designate the positions that correspond to the personal identification number.

The Oksman reference teaches a completely different operation. It is alleged that one would employ the teachings of the method of Goede within Oksman in order to enhance security of the system. However, the teaching of Goede is incompatible with that of Oksman. The Oksman system renders Goede system inoperable since there is no recording sheet 22 required by Oksman but it is required by Goede. Also the identification member 12 of Goede (as alleged in the office action) could not be used in Oksman's since the transparent portion of Oksman namely screen 13 has different light transmission characteristics different from adjacent zones for example (column 3, lines 60-68). Such a structure would not operate with Goede and vice versa. Combining teachings of references that render a reference inoperable are improper. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not obvious as alleged.

The dependent claims add additional novel and not obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 21, 2009

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 609-7599
Fax: (312) 609-5005

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414